

Remarks

The referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the referenced Office Action.

In the Claims, claims 1-30 are pending in the referenced application. Please cancel claims 22-26 without prejudice.

Claims 22-26 are rejected on the basis of statutory double patenting. However, claims 22-26 have been canceled and the rejection is therefore moot.

Claims 1-14 and 27-30 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 and 27-30 respectively of U.S. Patent 7,116,011 (011 patent) because the “claimed controller circuit has the same primary function as the voltage regulator” of the claims in the ‘011 patent.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Action in that in particular, Applicant asserts that a voltage regulator as claimed in the ‘011 patent does not teach or suggest *a more general* type of circuit such as an a controller circuit as claimed in the present Application, and therefore, each claim in the present application which includes an element relating to an integrated circuit comprising a controller circuit is not obvious based solely on the claims of the ‘011 patent. This rejection is therefore insufficient and at least for the above referenced reasons, cannot stand.

Thus the rejection of claims 1-14 and 27-30 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 15-21 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patent as being unpatentable over claims 15-21 of U.S. Patent 7,116,011 (011 patent) because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the parts of a circuit in accordance with claims 15-21 of the ‘011 patent into an integrated circuit as claimed in the

Application, because the use of one part or integrated construction instead of multiple part construction is a matter of engineering choice and not a patentable distinction.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Action in that in particular, Applicant asserts that an integrated circuit is not merely an “integrated construction instead of a multiple part construction.” Unlike the mechanical brake assembly of *Larson*, an integrated circuit comprises an entirely different mode of design, architecture and construction from a circuit and is therefore distinguishable from a simple mechanical integration and therefore provides a patentable distinction over a circuit as in the ‘011 patent. This rejection is therefore insufficient and at least for the above referenced reasons, cannot stand. Thus the rejection of claims 15-21 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Therefore all claims pending in the application, claims 1-21 and 27-30, should be allowed.

The Examiner is welcome to contact the Attorney of Record, Sanjay S. Gadkari (Reg. No. 55,796) at 503 264 4348 to discuss any matters with the case. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: August 22, 2007

/Sanjay S. Gadkari/

Sanjay S. Gadkari
Reg. No. 55,796

Intel Corporation
Mail Stop – JF3-147
2111 NE 25th Avenue
Hillsboro, OR 97124
Tele 503-264-4348
Fax 503-264-1729